

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

No claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Hence, Claims 1-46 are pending in the present application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008 is addressed hereinafter.

#### **I. ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART**

##### **A. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 18**

The Office Action rejected independent Claims 1 and 18 as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over an Oracle white paper titled “Oracle9iAS Portal Release 2 (Version 9.0.2): New Features”, which was published May 2002 and is referred to hereinafter as the “**Oracle White Paper**”. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant’s disclosure of his or her own work within the year before the application filing date cannot be used against him or her under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). To overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), Applicant may submit an Affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.132 to show derivation of the reference subject matter from applicant. (See *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982); MPEP §§ 2132.01.)

The present application claims priority and the effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) from U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/430,525 filed on December 2, 2002, which is less than one year after the 102(a) publication date of the **Oracle White Paper**. Further, submitted concurrently herewith is a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 by the inventors in the present application **Steve Burns, John G. Bellemore, Michael Gardner, and Vicki Shimizu**. The Declaration states that to the extent any portions of the **Oracle White**

**Paper**, when taken together, disclose the subject matter of independent Claims 1 and 18, these portions describe subject matter which is the inventors' own work and for which the inventors are sole inventors. Further, the Declaration states that the inventors believe that these portions of the **Oracle White Paper** are derived from designs, specifications, and presentations which the inventors prepared and made available for inclusion in the **Oracle White Paper**.

For the above reason, removal of the **Oracle White Paper** as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is respectfully requested. Since the **Oracle White Paper** does not qualify as a reference under any other section of 35 U.S.C. § 102, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 18 over the **Oracle White Paper** is respectfully requested.

B. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17 AND 19-46

Claims 2-17 and 19-46 were rejected as allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over the **Oracle White Paper**.

Each of Claims 2-17 and 19-46 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 18, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Thus, each of Claims 2-17 and 19-46 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 18. In addition, each of Claims 2-17 and 19-46 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-17 and 19-46 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-17 and 19-46 is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firms check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: May 15, 2008

/StoychoDDraganoff#56181/  
Stoycho D. Draganoff  
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076